

REMARKS

Claims 11-16 and 18-21 are pending in this application. Claims 11 and 18 are amended and claims 22 and 23 have been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Telephone Interviews

During a telephone communication with the Examiner on December 1, 2004, the independent claims 11 and 18 were discussed in view of the advisory action dated November 8, 2004. The Examiner stated that although the features of claims 22 and 23 were included into independent claims 11 and 18, which was suggested by the Examiner in an earlier telephone interview on August 27, 2004, based on his broadest interpretation the claims still read on the prior art. Particularly, the Examiner stated that the recitation of the "drive device being coupled to the signal converter portion" is still taught by the references. Thus, the Examiner did not enter the amendments in the previous response.

The Examiner suggested reciting the "drive device" as being "directly coupled to the signal converter portion" to overcome the cited prior art and place the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, in reliance upon the above noted Communications with the Examiner, claims 11 and 18 have been amended to include the features of dependent claims 22 and 23 and include the recitation

of the drive device being directly coupled to the signal converter portion” (emphasis added). Thus, the claims should now be in condition for allowance.

#### Prior Art Rejection

Although the claims should be in condition for allowance based on the telephone interview with the Examiner and the amendments made to the claims, applicants, provide the following arguments to address the outstanding rejection and illustrate the novelty of the amended claims over the prior art.

The Examiner rejects claims 11-16 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunzman, et al. (U.S. 6,054,832) in view Hewlett, et al. (US 5,812,303) and applicants’ admitted prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 recites a light source, light-transmitting filters, a light valve, white light transmitting filters, a signal converter portion and a drive device. The drive device is directly coupled to the signal converter portion and creates control signals that control both the light transmitting filters and the light valve.

Claim 18 also recites the method of decomposing light from a light source into a plurality of colors, controlling a white-light transmitting filter from a set of filters by a signal converter portion, controlling by a drive device that is directly coupled to said signal converter portion, the light transmitting filters and a light valve. The drive device, as also recited in claim 11, is directly coupled to the

signal converter portion and creates control signals that control both the light transmitting filters and light valve.

The combination of Kunzman and Hewlett does not teach the claimed invention. The Office Action relies upon Kunzman to teach the claimed drive device, light valve and light transmitting filters. The Office Action alleges that the SLM 28 of Kunzman corresponds to the claimed light valve, the color wheel 18 corresponds to the claimed light transmitting filters and the combination of the sensor board 22 and motor 20 correspond to the drive device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the drive device, as recited in claim 11, controls both the transmitting filters and light valve. To the contrary, the combination of the sensor board 22 and motor 20 in Kunzman, control the color wheel 18 only and not the SLM 28. The SLM 28 appears to be controlled by the electronics 24 to which it is connected. See column 3, lines 38-58 and Fig. 1. Thus, the sensor board 22 and motor 20 are not directly coupled to SLM 28. Therefore, Kunzman does not teach or suggest a drive device that is directly coupled to the signal converting portion and controls the light transmitting filters and light valve, as claimed.

Further, for the same reasons regarding claim 11, Kunzman fails to teach or suggest controlling, by a drive device directly coupled to said signal converter portion, the light transmitting filters and a light valve used to project light from the set of filters, recited in claim 18. The sensor board 22 and motor 20 of Kunzman only control the color wheel 18. The sensor board 22 and motor 20 are

not directly coupled to SLM 28. It is the electronics 24 that interacts with the SLM 28.

Therefore, in view of the above, every feature of the claims is not taught by the combination of Kunzman and Hewlett. Thus, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application.

#### Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 09/887,665

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb  
0925-0184P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)